

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/826,680	04/16/2004	Richard A. Weltzin	06132/091001 1402 EXAMINER	
21559	7590 12/15/2006			
CLARK & ELBING LLP			SNYDER, STUART	
101 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON, MA 02110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			1648	
			DATE MAILED: 12/15/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/826,680	WELTZIN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Stuart W. Snyder	1648			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Ag 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 are subject to restriction and/or estimated to the second s	vn from consideration. election requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the E				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some col None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/826,680

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1-12, drawn to a composition of attenuated vaccinia virus, classified in class 424, subclass 232.1.
 - II. Claim 13, drawn to a method of preventing variola virus, classified in class424, subclass 232.1.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, Invention I can be used as a vector for producing heterologous proteins.

No matter which group is elected, a further restriction is required. Since the decisions in In re Weber, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978) and In re Haas, 580 F.2d 461, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention. In re Harnisch, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and Ex parte Hozumi, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a common utility, and (2) share a substantial structural feature essential to that utility.

Application/Control Number: 10/826,680

Art Unit: 1648

Applicants are required to elect one peptide sequence for examination. This is not an election of species because the sequences recited in claim 7 lack unity of invention and so do not constitute a proper Markush group. Specifically, the sequences do not share a substantial structural feature essential to the asserted utility. Review of SEQ ID Nos: 3-471 (odd numbers) shows that there is no substantial shared structural feature present in fragments. Therefore each peptide and peptide-encoding nucleotide fragment is considered a patentably distinct invention and clonal strains of attenuated vaccinia virus defined by hybridization to them are patentably distinct.

Claim 7 links the inventions of group I and claim 13 liknks the inventions of group II. The restriction requirement among the linked inventions is **subject to** the nonallowance of the linking claim, claim 7. Upon the indication of allowability of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions **shall** be withdrawn and any claims depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable linking claims will be rejoined and fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104 **Claims that require all the limitations of an allowable linking claim** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. Applicant(s) are advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, the allowable linking

Art Unit: 1648

claim, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 443 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stuart W. Snyder whose telephone number is (571) 272-9945. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM-5:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce R. Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SWS

BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Bure Campell